IT Report For Fairfax County

Sadaqat Ahmad

Tim Thompson

April 2, 2018

Budget and Staff Resources

			FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2018	FY 2019
Category			Actual	Adopted	Revised	Advertised
FUNI	DING					
Ехре	nditures:					
Personnel Services		\$2,262,764	\$2,167,058	\$2,163,256	\$2,242,431	
Operating Expenses		6,876,145	7,633,698	8,272,305	7,633,698	
Total Expenditures		\$9,138,909	\$9,800,756	\$10,435,561	\$9,876,129	
ALITE	IORIZED POSITIONS/FULL-TIME EQUIVAL	ENT (ETE	1			
MUII	IONIZED FOOITIONS/ FULL-TIME EQUIVAL	LITT (I IL	1			
	gular	LINI (I IL	27 / 27	27 / 27	27 / 27	27 / 27
			• III		27 / 27 Mail Services	27 / 27
	gular	1	27 / 27			
	gular Print Shop	1	27 / 27 Archives and Record Mgmt		Mail Services	lyst II
Re 1	gular Print Shop Printing Services Manager	1 1 2	27 / 27 Archives and Record Mgmt IT Program Director I		Mail Services Management Ana	lyst II sistant V
Re 1	Print Shop Printing Services Manager Customer Services Specialists	1 1	27 / 27 Archives and Record Mgmt IT Program Director I IT Program Manager I	1 1	Mail Services Management Ana Administrative Ass	lyst II sistant V

Fund 60030 Technology Infrastructure Services

Budget and Staff Resources

			FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2018	FY 2019
Category			Actual	Adopted	Revised	Advertised
FUND	DING					
Expe	nditures:					
Personnel Services		\$6,505,752	\$7,931,704	\$7,931,704	\$8,236,526	
Operating Expenses		28,007,365	30,535,138	33,499,112	30,967,87	
Capital Equipment		1,159,293	2,592,340	4,514,050	4,800,000	
Total Expenditures		\$35,672,410	\$41,059,182	\$45,944,866	\$44,004,39	
AUTH	ORIZED POSITIONS/FULL-TIME EQUIV	ALENT (I	FTE)			
Regular		73 / 73	73 / 73	69 / 69	69 / 69	
	Communication/Infrastructure	Data Center Services		Radio Center Services		
	Program Management	1	Info. Tech. Program Manager II	1 In	fo. Tech. Program N	lanager II
1	Info. Tech. Program Director III	1	Systems Programmer III		etwork/Telecom. An	
2	Network/Telecom. Analysts IV	5	Systems Programmers II	3 Network/Telecom. Analysts III		alysts III
		1	Systems Programmer I	4 Network/Telecom. Analysts II		
	Server/SAN Infrastructure	1	Programmer Analyst III	1 N	etwork/Telecom. An	alyst I
2	Network/Telecom. Analysts IV	1	Programmer Analyst II			
2	Network/Telecom. Analysts I	1	IT Technician II		etwork/I-Net	
		3	Network/Telecom. Analysts I		ifo. Tech. Program [
	Desktop Support/				fo. Tech. Program N	
	PC Replacement				etwork/Telecom. An	
1	Network/Telecom. Analyst III				etwork/Telecom. An	
22	Enterprise IT Technicians			4 Network/Telecom. Analysts II		
				1 In	fo. Security Analyst	IV
тот	AL POSITIONS					
	Positions / 69.0 FTE					
00 1	OSITIONS / OS.OT IE					

After meeting with Wanda Gibson, head of Fairfax County's IT Department, and reviewing the relevant budget documents, I can say from my personal expertise in the information technology arena, trying to find savings by shaving the budget of the IT department will be problematic to say the least and catastrophic if actually implemented.

The department seems to be run incredible well. A test I personally have is the SAP/Oracle/IBM test. The business model of these companies is to low bid for database work, then bring in their own 'contractors' once the database is up and running. This cost is tremendous to local and federal governments. A real world example is the Northrup Grumman \$13 billion dollar contract with the Commonwealth of Virginia. Ms. Gibson bought the SAP database, but instead of bringing in their contractors, had staff trained on the software: the correct way to implement a database purchase.

Another test they passed is by implementing near real time uptime instead of 100% uptime. The cost of the 'last mile' can sometimes equal the cost from getting from 0 to 99%. Implementing a real world understanding of how computers and databases and applications work have saved the county hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars.

The biggest reason I would find in cutting the budget for the IT department is that the IT department doesn't exist in a vacuum, it actually sits behinds all the other agencies and departments.

Two examples would be the new body camera issue and citizen health records.

The body camera recordings done by police officers of Fairfax County needs to be stored somewhere and they need to be stored for a significant period of time as determined by our legislators. The IT department calculated that the storage size (and its necessary duplicate as all digital items must have a backup) is 5.6 Petabytes. A standard photo one takes on an iPhone is approximately 2MB. That is a difference of 6.5 billion... The yearly cost of this storage is between \$1m and \$8m. The cost gets borne by the IT department. If we want to save money, we should ask legislators to either rethink the body camera issue, either implementing it, or reducing the number of years a backup is needed for court cases.

Another example is legislators asking that health data be stored for 75 years, a figure arrived at by assuming the average longevity of a human in Fairfax County. This cost is also entirely borne by the IT department. Legislators need to get greater input from the IT department and come to 21st century understandings of technology before legislation like this is passed.

The department already implements its own 5 year product lifespan and has implemented such lifespan throughout the county. A standard business lifespan of a technology product (a computer or iPhone for example) is 3 years. The County can't really find any cost savings here. My personal recommendation would be for the County to embrace Windows 10 and SSDs in its implementation. This would cost more immediately but save money in the long run as hardware lifespan might be extended to 6 years. The department already is cutthroat in its licensing so there's no cost savings that can be done here either.

The average salary is around \$80,000 far below private sector wages. Falls in line with relevant public sector wages. The number of employees also falls in line with a number needed to run an IT department that services over a million residents.